

**REMARKS**

In a Final Office Action dated December 7, 2010 ("Office Action"), the Examiner rejected claims 21-23, 26-27, 29, 32-33, 36-39, and 41 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,659,616 to Sudia ("*Sudia*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,544,322 to Cheng et al. ("*Cheng*"); rejected claims 24-25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Sudia* in view of *Cheng* in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,956,408 to Arnold ("*Arnold*"); rejected claim 28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Sudia* in view of *Cheng* in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,537,618 to Boulton et al. ("*Boulton*"); rejected claim 30 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Sudia* in view of *Cheng* in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,677,955 to Doggett et al. ("*Doggett*"); rejected claim 31 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Sudia* in view of *Cheng* in further view of *Doggett* and U.S. Patent No. 5,724,424 to Gifford ("*Gifford*"); and rejected claims 34-35 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Sudia* in view of *Cheng* in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,978,567 to Rebane et al. ("*Rebane*").

By this Amendment, Applicant has amended claims 21 and 41. These amendments add no new matter and are fully supported by the specification. Applicant respectfully traverses the aforementioned rejections and request reconsideration based on the following remarks. Further, Applicant does not necessarily agree with or acquiesce in the Examiner's characterization of the claims or the applied references, even if those characterizations are not addressed herein.

**Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103**

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 21-39 and 41 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) because a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established with respect to these claims, as is discussed in detail below.

Claims 21-23, 26-27, 29, 32-33, 36-39, and 41

Claims 21-23, 26-27, 29, 32-33, 36-39, and 41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Sudia* in view of *Cheng*. Amended claim 21 recites, *inter alia*, a method for providing access to an online service including:

“...collecting, by [a] first electronic appliance, audit record information relating to the user’s use of [an] online service.”

Applicant respectfully submits that *Sudia* and *Cheng*, whether viewed separately or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest at least these claimed features.

*Sudia* generally discloses methods of using “digital signatures and certificates for digital signatures in a commercial cryptographic system for enforcing security policies and authorization requirements in a manner that reduces risks to users.” *Sudia* at Col. 1: ll. 11-15. Particularly, *Sudia* discloses methods that utilize “public key certificates” created by a trusted issuer and “attribute certificates ... created on presentation of ... proper credentials by [a] user,” in a system for enforcing electronic security policies. See *e.g.*, *Id.* at Col. 3: ll. 42-57, and Col. 4: ll. 16-20. Nowhere, however, in the passages cited by the Examiner or elsewhere, does *Sudia* disclose, or even suggest, a method for providing access to an online service that includes, *inter alia*, “collecting, by [a] first electronic appliance, audit record information relating to the user’s use of [an] online service,” as recited in claim 21. Rather, *Sudia* is limited to a “signature verification model” where no collection relating to a user’s use of an online service is performed.

In the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that *Sudia*’s disclosure of “transaction text 1202” corresponds to “information relating to the user’s use of [an] online service.” *Office Action at page 4*. Applicant respectfully submits, however, that this characterization is inconsistent with the disclosure of *Sudia*. For example, *Sudia* discloses that its “transaction text 1202” is included as part of a “confirmation message consisting of the original transaction 1201 (the transaction text 1202 and the sending user’s signature)” which is sent by a recipient to a “user’s sponsor 1215, as specified 1204 in the sender’s authorization certificate 1202” if the recipient verifies a

"sender's signature 1203" and a "sponsor's signature 1205" on the "authorization certificate 1202." *Sudia* at Col. 13: ll. 7-12. That is, *Sudia*'s "transaction text 1202" is a passive confirmation sent by a recipient confirming that signatures associated with a transaction have been verified. Thus, as discussed above, *Sudia* is limited to a "signature verification model" where no collection relating to a user's use of an online service is performed. Accordingly, *Sudia* fails to disclose or suggest a method that includes "collecting, by [a] first electronic appliance, audit record information relating to [a] user's use of [an] online service," as recited in claim 21.

*Cheng* fails to cure at least the aforementioned deficiencies of *Sudia*. *Cheng* discloses a "system and method for defining a platform-independent framework for a trusted third-party network authentication protocol that permits a client requesting the services of a target server to derive a valid authentication path that complies with [an] authentication policy of the target service, and if necessary, [a] policy specified by the client." *Cheng* at Col. 3: ll. 13-19. Nowhere, however, does *Cheng* disclose, or even suggest, a method for providing access to an online service that includes "collecting, by [a] first electronic appliance, audit record information relating to the user's use of [an] online service," as recited in claim 21. Therefore, *Cheng* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Sudia*.

For at least the above reasons, *Sudia* and *Cheng*, whether viewed separately or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest each and every feature recited in claim 21. Therefore, Applicant submits that *Sudia* and *Cheng* do not render claim 21 obvious. Claims 22-23, 26-27, 29, 32-33, 36-39, and 41 depend from claim 21 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 21. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 21-23, 26-27, 29, 32-33, 36-39, and 41 are allowable and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 21-23, 26-27, 29, 32-33, 36-39, and 41 under 35 U.S.C. §103.

Claims 24-25

Claims 24-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Sudia* in view of *Cheng* in further view of *Arnold*. Claims 24-25 depend from claim 21 and therefore incorporate all of the elements recited in claim 21. As discussed above, *Sudia* and *Cheng* fail to disclose, or even suggest a method for providing access to an online service that includes "collecting, by [a] first electronic appliance, audit record information relating to the user's use of [an] online service," as recited in claim 21. Applicant respectfully submits that *Arnold* fails to cure at least the aforementioned deficiencies of *Sudia* and *Cheng*.

*Arnold* generally discloses an "apparatus and method for secure distribution of software, software updates, and configuration data." *Arnold* at Col. 1: ll. 11-13. More specifically, *Arnold* discloses an apparatus that utilizes "cryptography ... to protect software or data updates sent to computer products or peripherals using non-secure distribution channels." *Id.* at Col. 5: ll. 36-38. Nowhere, however, does *Arnold* disclose, or even suggest, a method for providing access to an online service that includes, *inter alia*, "collecting, by [a] first electronic appliance, information relating to [a] user's use of [an] online service," as recited in claim 21. Accordingly, *Arnold* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Sudia* and *Cheng*.

For at least the above reasons, *Sudia*, *Cheng*, and *Arnold*, whether viewed separately or in any combination, fail to disclose or suggest each and every feature required in claims 24-25, and therefore do not render these claims obvious. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 24-25 are allowable and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. §103.

Claim 28

Claim 28 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Sudia* in view of *Cheng* in further view of *Boulton*. Claim 28 depends from claim 21 and therefore incorporates all of the elements recited in claim 21. As discussed above, *Sudia* and *Cheng* fail to disclose, or even suggest, a method for providing access to an online service that includes

"collecting, by [a] first electronic appliance, audit record information relating to the user's use of [an] online service," as recited in claim 21. Applicant respectfully submits that *Boulton* fails to cure at least the aforementioned deficiencies of *Sudia* and *Cheng*.

*Boulton* generally discloses methods and apparatuses relating to obtaining self-reported user feedback. See e.g., *Boulton* at Col. 3: ll. 56-57. More particularly, *Boulton* discloses use of a "feedback viewing interface ... [that] receives feedback data from one or more users and presents the feedback data to a reviewer." *Id.* at Col. 3: ll. 59-62. The feedback viewing interface includes, for example, feedback dialog and feedback message boxes which are populated by a user to provide self-reported feedback. *Id.* at Col. 4: ll. 20-23. Nowhere, however, does *Boulton* disclose or suggest a method for providing access to an online service that includes, *inter alia*, "collecting, by [a] first electronic appliance, information relating to [a] user's use of [an] online service," as recited in claim 21. Accordingly, *Boulton* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Sudia* and *Cheng*.

For at least the above reasons, *Sudia*, *Cheng*, and *Boulton*, whether viewed separately or in any combination, fail to disclose or suggest each and every feature required in claim 28, and therefore do not render claim 28 obvious. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 28 is allowable and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. §103.

#### Claim 30

Claim 30 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Sudia* in view of *Cheng* in further view of *Doggett*. Claim 30 depends from claim 21 and therefore incorporates all of the elements recited in claim 21. As discussed above, *Sudia* and *Cheng* fail to disclose, or even suggest, a method for providing access to an online service that includes "collecting, by [a] first electronic appliance, audit record information relating to the user's use of [an] online service," as recited in claim 21. Applicant respectfully submits that *Doggett* fails to cure at least the aforementioned deficiencies of *Sudia* and *Cheng*.

*Doggett* generally discloses electronic instruments for effectuating the secure transfer of electronic funds. See e.g., *Doggett* at Col. 1: ll. 4-5. More particularly, *Doggett* discloses a "computer-based method in which an electronic instrument [that includes an electronic signature of a payer] is created for effectuating a transfer of funds from an account of the payer in a fund-holding institution to a payee." *Id.* at Col 3: ll. 2-6. Nowhere, however, does *Doggett* disclose or suggest a method for providing access to an online service that includes "collecting, by [a] first electronic appliance, audit record information relating to the user's use of [an] online service," as recited in claim 21. Accordingly, *Doggett* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Sudia* and *Cheng*.

For at least the above reasons, *Sudia*, *Cheng*, and *Doggett*, whether viewed separately or in any combination, fail to disclose or suggest each and every feature required in claim 30, and therefore do not render claim 30 obvious. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 30 is allowable and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. §103.

Claim 31

Claim 31 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Sudia* in view of *Cheng* in further view of *Doggett* and *Gifford*. Claim 31 depends from claim 21 and therefore incorporates all of the elements recited in claim 21. As discussed above, *Sudia*, *Cheng*, and *Doggett* all fail to disclose, or even suggest, a method for providing access to an online service that includes "collecting, by [a] first electronic appliance, audit record information relating to the user's use of [an] online service," as recited in claim 21. Applicant respectfully submits that *Gifford* fails to cure at least the aforementioned deficiencies of *Sudia*, *Cheng*, and *Doggett*.

*Gifford* generally discloses a "network sales system for enabling users to purchase products using a plurality of buyer computers that communicate over a network with a plurality of merchant computers." *Gifford* at Col. 3: ll. 14-17. Nowhere, however, does *Gifford* disclose, or even suggest, a method for providing access to an online service that includes "collecting, by

[a] first electronic appliance, audit record information relating to the user's use of [an] online service," as recited in claim 21. Accordingly, *Gifford* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Sudia*, *Cheng*, and *Doggett*.

For at least the above reasons, *Sudia*, *Cheng*, *Doggett*, and *Gifford*, whether viewed separately or in any combination, fail to disclose or suggest each and every feature required in claim 31, and therefore do not render claim 31 obvious. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 31 is allowable and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. §103.

Claims 34-35

Claims 34-35 stand under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Sudia* in view of *Cheng* in further view of *Rebane*. Claims 34-35 depend from claim 21 and therefore incorporates all of the elements recited in claim 21. As discussed above, *Sudia* and *Cheng* fail to disclose, or even suggest, a method for providing access to an online service that includes "collecting, by [a] first electronic appliance, audit record information relating to the user's use of [an] online service," as recited in claim 21. Applicant respectfully submits that *Rebane* fails to cure at least the aforementioned deficiencies of *Sudia* and *Cheng*.

*Rebane* generally discloses a "system and method to efficiently deliver multimedia interactive and linear programming on a large-scale network." *Rebane* at Abstract. Nowhere, however, does *Rebane* disclose or suggest a method for providing access to an online service that includes "collecting, by [a] first electronic appliance, audit record information relating to the user's use of [an] online service," as recited in claim 21. Accordingly, *Rebane* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Sudia* and *Cheng*.

For at least the above reasons, *Sudia*, *Cheng*, and *Rebane*, whether viewed separately or in any combination, fail to disclose or suggest each and every feature required in claims 34-35, and therefore do not render claims 34-35 obvious. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully

submits that claims 34-35 are allowable and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. §103.

Conclusion


In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: June 7, 2010

By:   
Linda J. Thayer  
Reg. No. 45,681  
617-452-1600